

measurement and compliance assurance, with financial incentives for superior performance and corresponding penalties, even including termination, for failure.

"Present ASPR regulations stress competitive low bid * * *. It seems highly unlikely that present procurement practice will change until the ASPR's are expanded and the military services are directed to analyze and justify each procurement on the basis of total cost.

"In forecasting total cost, it is necessary (that we develop data and skill to prepare skillfully) a maintenance cost study, or logistics study, to be incorporated with the initial or acquisition price."

As Richardson points out, without ASPR changes few military buyers are likely to award many contracts on anything other than the lowest bid price—particularly in the face of the heat wave from your cost reduction program. There are too many pressures to do things the easier way.

But, as Richardson adds, in what amounts to the plea to the field echelons to put pressure on the front office, "It is time we told the Congress and the taxpayer (and, adds Air Force Management, 'Secretary McNamara') that we need their support to save them money—and that we are prepared to prove how we can do it.

"They must be convinced that we are not against competition, per se; that we recognize real competition as a necessary and healthy process which will force lower costs. But it only works when you are competing apples against apples."

An Arms Race in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing concern of many citizens over the Vietnam crisis is reflected in editorial comment of our leading newspapers.

Chicago's American, in an editorial Saturday, March 7, ponders one aspect of the Vietnamese situation that the administration should well have looked into some time ago.

I insert the article for the attention of the Members:

AN ARMS RACE IN VIETNAM?

While the United States has been threatening to get tougher in South Vietnam, the Communist Government of North Vietnam has been getting tougher. It has decided, apparently, that if the United States is willing to let the guerrilla warfare go on and on, it isn't, and accordingly it has been pouring increased numbers of larger and more modern weapons south to its embattled Communists in South Vietnam is an effort to bring the war to an end.

This arms speedup was announced in Washington by Secretary of Defense Robert A. McNamara just before he took off for South Vietnam at the head of an inspection team which is going to consider, again, what this country should do about the situation there. McNamara said the situation was grave. He pointed out also that the new weapons which the Communists are getting have been made in Red China.

So it comes down to this: The real contest in Vietnam obviously is between Red China and the United States, and the Chinese Communist Government is putting it on the basis of arms production. The United States

surely ought to be able to win that sort of contest with the comparatively unindustrialized Red Chinese. So why don't we supply the South Vietnamese anti-Communists with so many superior weapons that the North Vietnamese Communists will seem almost unarmed by comparison.

If it is argued that this might offend the Red Chinese, the fact is that they are already offended with the United States to the point of incoherence. Anyway, if they are willing to take the risk of arming the North Vietnamese against us, shouldn't we be ready to take the risk of arming the South Vietnamese even better?

"The Republican Challenge: A Call to Leadership"—Address by Governor Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Governor Scranton gave an excellent address before 1,400 members and guests at the Economic Club in New York City on March 3, 1964.

Bill Scranton received a standing ovation as he finished, which was a real tribute to his leadership.

I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people these main portions of Governor Scranton's address:

SCRANTON BIDS GOP TAKE LEAD

Our political parties are, in many ways, curious creatures.

Both of them are formed through the alliance of men, their loyalties, their aspirations, their emotions, their highest ideals, their basest desires.

In the course of history, each party is propelled toward a peculiar role in American politics. Conviction, opportunity, connivance, political skill, happenstance—all of these have contrived to determine on the shifting national scene which party has stood as the majority and which as the minority.

The fact is that in almost every moment of the past 32 years the Democratic Party has been the majority party in America.

The fact is that the time has come to say that, by the rules of the game, that majority party is to be held accountable for the failures which dot the national landscape.

The fact is that the deadlock in the Democratic Party is the chief reason for the deadlock in American democracy.

The forces which have combined to become the Democratic Party are forces which by their very nature collide in deadlock. It is a party of dreams on the one hand; and of reaction on the other.

BLOCKED BY REACTIONARIES

The party when it dreams has noble thoughts of shining cities, equal opportunities, and social progress. The party when it governs is hamstringed by its reactionaries, who smash the dreams and leave the political landscape strewn with the broken promises of a deadlocked party.

Denial of civil rights to the American Negro has, of course, been a critical shortcoming of our society for many years—including the years of the Roosevelt administration. But, until recently, this has been a quiet crisis. By its very nature, the Democratic

Party has been incapable of dealing with a social crisis in the kindling stage. A roaring fire is demanded before they can act, and in the case of civil rights they cannot act even now.

What is the upshot of this deadlock?

The liberal and theoretical wing of the party, frustrated by continued impotence has resorted to proposals more notable for their trappings than for their relevance to real problems.

Time after time, that party has responded to problems with answers which not only are not solutions, but have the additional bad effects of needlessly proliferating the Central Government and doing violence to our Federal system.

All of this because of the deadlock within the party.

The Democratic Party has gone back to the sterile approaches which for 30 years have failed to solve our most pressing national problems.

The first sign of this return came with the new Federal budget.

First, that document bowed to conservative elements in the party by appearing to show a decrease in Government spending. But then, to keep warm the spirits of the liberal enthusiasts, word was spread that the magic interworkings of the budget provided for no decrease at all.

In the recent tax bill we have seen the effects of the Democratic deadlock. Tax reform joined expenditure cuts on the scrap heap, and only the politically attractive tax cut was enacted.

Nowhere today, however, are the calamitous results of the deadlock more apparent than in the struggle for effective civil rights legislation. I confess to tremendous pride in my fellow Republicans in the House of Representatives. They got civil rights out of committee, and they voted 4 to 1 in favor of the bill. Without their votes the Democratic majority would have once again been unable to act.

Where, then, stands the Republican Party in relation to this deadlock which for three decades has all but paralyzed our society?

Is there any evidence that the Republican Party, if it were to become the majority, could effectively lead America and avoid the present dreary impasse?

In the first place, I believe that when the history of this era is finally written, men who treasure the Federal system and the American concept of checks and balances will rise to cheer the Republican Party.

We are the conservative party in this Nation, and we are proud of it. But we are a conservative party which understands what Edmund Burke meant when he said that "a state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."

The Republican Party gave us the Morrill Act which set up the land-grant colleges, the schools that became our great State universities of today, renowned the world over for the excellence of their teaching and their research.

But the Republican Party did not put the Federal Government into the business of running the State universities.

The Republican Party pledged, in its very first platform, the one upon which Lincoln ran, to build a railroad to the Pacific. It redeemed that pledge. But it did not put the Federal Government into the railroad business.

On and on the record runs. Through all the years the Republicans served the Nation as the majority party, they made their best contributions when they were conserving America's principles by solving America's problems.

PATH FOR CONSERVATIVES

They (Republicans) must make it clear that they do not believe America's problems will disappear if we all merely wrap ourselves in the Stars and Stripes. They must make it

clear that true conservatives will have nothing to do with the forces of reaction.

The whole point of Republican insistence on strong State governments is the Republican belief that State government can in many areas accomplish more and do the job better than the Central Government can.

To prove that contention more than a platitude, the Republican Party must devise imaginative and exciting means to give the State governments the financial strength to conquer many of the grim problems that threaten our society.

For instance, why can't the Federal Government turn over to the States a percentage of the taxes now collected by Washington?

Why can't we devise a method of expanding the State's share of the national tax dollar?

The answer is that of course we can.

We can devise in a hundred different bold new attacks on the problems of America and we can do it without going outside the framework of the Constitution and the Federal principle.

But none of these things, our recent history makes clear, can be achieved by the deadlocked Democratic Party.

Progress, today, can be achieved only through the Republican Party.

As a Republican, I say to my party:

Let us show what free men can do to shape their own destiny.

Let us solve the deadlock in democracy.

Let us begin to act like a majority party and in so doing we shall lead America to her finest hour.

Jewish Telegraph Agency Reports on Need for Congressional Review of Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the growing public interest in the need for an objective review of our immigration policy is reflected in a column written by Jessie Halpern, Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraph Agency. As this article relates, there has not been such a systematic review by Congress in over 40 years. Miss Halpern's article follows:

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF IMMIGRATION POLICY

On the eve of the 80th anniversary of Hias, there is perhaps no issue more complicated or timely for American as well as world Jewry, or one which demands as much attention, enlightenment and action, as the reform of outdated U.S. immigration policies.

The blatant injustices of the archaic system and the power of rigid adherents to ancient policy speak for themselves. The tireless efforts of knowledgeable and concerned legislators and scholars on behalf of immigration reform are less well known.

Too obvious is the sorry realization that there has been no constructive review of U.S. immigration policy in over 40 years. Additionally, since the end of World War II, Presidential efforts to abolish from immigration policy the odious "national origins" quota system have failed.

In 1953 the only statutory combined committee in Congress—the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy—came into existence. Chaired by the harsh, unbending late Pennsylvania Democrat, Francis E. Walter, coauthor of the McCarran-Walter Act, the pressing needs for reforms made little headway. But when the late President Kennedy last July publicly urged the repeal of immigration quotas, new hopes were aroused. Ironically, of the last budgetary request made by President Kennedy on November 21—1 day before his assassination—the only item concerning legislative requirements which was not passed was that which would have given the stalemated joint committee the meager sum of \$104,460 to have a staff and pay for operations. Committee action would continue to stagnate.

Unfortunately, the efforts of one of the most well-informed, but little-recognized fighters for immigration reform, Democratic Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN of Ohio, have, over the years, been thwarted and eclipsed by ignorance or stubbornness. Of primary significance had been the power of Congressman Walter. The public had been deceived into thinking that FEIGHAN whistled Walter's tune. However, since Walter's death this past year, Representative FEIGHAN has been elevated to the chairmanship of the struggling Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. In addition, he is now ranking majority member of the House Judiciary Committee, headed by New York Democrat, EMANUEL CELLER.

In immigration reform matters, FEIGHAN had had to contend with lack of funds, a paucity of general knowledge in this complex area, and vestiges of hard-core opposition from congressional Members as well as demographers who adhere to population standing room only concepts.

Back in 1957 Congressman FEIGHAN presented a proposal to Congress which sought a new and selective method to distribute authorized but unused quota numbers, eliminate the national origins system, emphasize the desirability of bringing to the United States yearly persons with important technical or professional skills, provide a haven for victims of totalitarian aggression, and to reunite families and relatives. Since then FEIGHAN has continued to remind legislators of the antiquated immigration laws, but has failed to get necessary congressional support.

President Kennedy's appeal to Congress last July called for the gradual elimination of the quota system. The main proposals in the bill were: (1) That existing quotas be gradually reduced at the rate of 20 percent per year with a reserve pool for redistribution; (2) that natives of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any one year; and (3) that upon recommendations from a seven-man immigration board, the President be authorized to reserve up to 50 percent of unallocated quotas for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent for refugees affected by sudden dislocation.

While less articulate on the matter than his predecessors, President Johnson strongly supports the late President's proposals. Among the first groups the new President met with this year to discuss immigration reform needs were representatives from the Joint Distribution Committee, United HIAS, the American Jewish Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, the National Community Relations Advisory Council, and the Anti-Defamation League. However, there has been no White House Action since then.

There is no doubt among observers of the national scene that the future of action on immigration reforms hinges on the effectiveness of Congressman FEIGHAN in his new role of joint committee chairman. FEIGHAN has

realistically emphasized the need for action in the matter and the equally important requirement for educating Congress as well as the citizenry. He is now confidently assuming the leadership in a battle which he previously fought with little help. At the same time he knows his efforts must be directed toward an immigration system which will best benefit the United States both domestically and internationally.

Certainly the impact of the necessary U.S. immigration reforms upon world Jewry would be more than of passing significance. Reforms would especially aid Jews in Eastern Europe desiring to flee from communism—when such emigration is allowed. Remnants of Jews originally from the Soviet Union and now residing in Far Eastern areas such as Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Malaya would also be justly affected, as would be the future of Jews born and now residing in problematic situations in African countries.

One further important consequence of the implementation of reform proposals would be the elimination of gross financial burdens too often imposed upon families seeking to immigrate and reunite with relatives in the United States.

It is hoped that present congressional pre-occupations with civil rights, farm, taxation, foreign aid, and other matters will not overshadow the overdue need for urgent action on the reform of our present antiquated immigration laws.

Baker Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the old saying "There's no place like home," I would like to add that there's certainly no place like home when it happens to be Baker, Oreg., which, I am proud to say, is my hometown.

Its idyllic setting in the valley of the Blue Mountains, a sportsman's paradise, its diversification of industry, from raising top-grade beef, to lumber, agriculture, and mining, and its colorful history are aptly described in an article featured in the February 1964 issue of the magazine *Cascades*, which I would like to insert in the Appendix for the interest of my colleagues. I am sure that, after reading this article, they will understand my great pride in being able to call myself a native of Baker. I would also like to extend an invitation to my colleagues to come and see this magnificent Baker country for themselves.

The article follows:

BAKER COUNTRY

Baker, beef, and the Blue Mountains are more than idle alliteration in a rugged eastern Oregon country known for its rich tradition and individualism.

To know Baker, Oreg., is to recognize it as the hub of an area which boasts top-grade beef, lumbering, mining, agriculture, and a paradise for highland sportsmen. The names of nearby towns tell a descriptive story of the area's diversification.

It seems natural that this rich cattle country would have a town named "Hereford." The only surprising element is that Angus